UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/272,955	03/19/1999	ALBERT D. BAKER	15-5-2-5-4	6330

7590 10/02/2002

Joseph B. Ryan
Ryan, Mason & Lewis LLP
90 FOREST AVENUE
LOCUST VALLEY, NY 11560

EXAMINER
LAO, LUN YI

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2673	

DATE MAILED: 10/02/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office
ASSISTANT SECRETARY AND COMMISSIONER OF
PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Paper No. 12

Application Number: 09/272,955
Filing Date: 03/19/1999
Appellant(s): A.D. Baker et al

Joseph B. Ryan
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to appellant's brief on appeal filed on September 04, 2002

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

A statement identifying the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of the claims contained in the brief is correct.

4) Status of Amendments After Final

No amendment after final has been filed.

(5) Summary of Invention

The summary of invention contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Issues

The appellant's statement of the issues in the brief is correct.

(7) Grouping of Claims

Appellant's brief includes a statement that claims 1, 2, 8, 10-12, 18 and 20-22; 3 and 13; 4 and 14; 6 and 16; and 24 and 17 do not stand or fall together and provides reasons as set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(c)(7) and (c)(8).

(8) Claims Appealed

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(9) Prior Art of Record

NUMBER	*NAME*	*DATE*	**FILING DATA**
5,956,655	Suzuki et al	9/21/1999	03/15/1996

(10) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

I. Claims 1-4, 6-8, 10-14, 16-18 and 20- 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Suzuki et al(5,965,655).

As to claims 1-4, 6-8, 10-14, 16-28 and 20- 22 , Suzuki et al teach a method for controlling a terminal(1100a or 1100b or 2100) on a communication system comprising the steps

of utilizing an automated set of operations(operation program in terminals) to generate information representative of a first state machine(1100a); and a second state machine(1100b) for controlling a first set of labels for soft-label keys(1A-1D)(Japanese characters) of the first terminal with a first user and a second set of labels for soft-label keys(1A-1D)(English characters) (see figures 2-4D, 5-9; 24, 25, 28; column 4, lines 35-68; columns 5-7; column 8, lines 1-5 and column 28, lines 15-39).

As to claims 11 and 22, Suzuki et al teach a memory(1109 or 1219) for storing at least a portion of information(see figures 26, 27 and column 24, lines 10-15 and lines 41-43).

As to claims 8 and 18, Suzuki et al teach a method for generating different set of operations for different state machine(see figures 3, 25).

As to claims 10 and 20-21, Suzuki et al teach the set of operations are implemented at least in part in software associated with a switch of the system(see figures 24-26; column 23, lines 27-68 and column 24, lines 1-20.

(11) Response to Argument

Appellants argue that Suzuki does not teach first and second state machines producing different SLK(soft label key) labels for the respective first and second terminals and an automated set of operations process input indicative of terminal features desired by each of a first user and a second user in order to generate the respective first and second state machines on pages 5-6. The examiner disagrees with that since Suzuki has disclosed a first state machine(1100a) and a second state machine(1100b) can produce different SLK(soft label key) displays(e.g. English and

Japanese) for the respective first and second terminals(1100a, 1100b from one state(initial state(Fig. 4A) to memory state(Fig. 4B)))(see figures 2, 3, 24; column 27, lines 51-59 and column 28, lines 15-26); first automated set of operations process input(automated set(MEMORY CALL, AUX. FUNCTION, REDIAL) OR (CALL, RE-TURN, ▲,▼))(see figures 4A-4G in English) for the first user and a second automated set of operation process input set(automated set(MEMORY CALL, AUX. FUNCTION, REDIAL) OR (CALL, RE-TURN, ▲,▼))((see Fig. 4A-4G in Japanese) for the second user(see column 5, lines 33-68; columns 6-7; column 8, lines 1-11; column 27, lines 51-59 and column 28, lines 15-26);

Applicants argue Suzuki does not teach a control table specifying a set of label identifiers for each of at least a subset of the plurality of states of the terminal, and a label table specifying, for each of at least a subset of the labels identified by a given one of the label identifiers, a character string corresponding to the label, a feature identifier associated with the label, and presentation attribute on pages 6-7. The examiner disagrees with that since Suzuki teaches a control table(see figures 5-9) specifying a set of label identifiers(MEMORY CALL, RE-DIAL, AND AUX.FUNCTION) for each of at least a subset of the plurality of states of the terminal(MEMORY CALL STATE, RETURN STATE), and a label table specifying, for each of at least a subset of the labels(e.g. CALL, RETURN) identified by a given one of the label identifiers(RE-DIAL), a character string(RE-DIAL) corresponding to the label, a feature identifier associated with the label, and presentation attribute(see figures 5-9 and column 28, lines 15-39).

Appellants argue that Suzuki does not teach an operation for checking a system database to extract a system identifier and a character string for the corresponding label; an operation for determining a descendant relationship definition for the extract feature identifier and an operation for creating a state in the state machine based on the relationship definition for the extract feature identifier on pages 7-8. The examiner disagrees with that since Suzuki has disclose such operation for generating a plurality set of soft key labels(see figures 4A-9; column 12, lines 19-68; column 13 and column 14, lines 1-25).

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

Lun-yi, Lao

Lun-Yi Lao
Primary Examiner

Conference:

Steven Saras

Kent Chang